

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alaxandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/016,840	12/13/2001	Ronald L. Stewart	SP00-361	7492	
22928 7	590 07/15/2003				
CORNING INCORPORATED			EXAMINER		
	SP-TI-3-1 CORNING, NY 14831		BLACKWELL RUDAS	BLACKWELL RUDASIL, GWENDOLYN A	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
			1775	11	
			DATE MAILED: 07/15/2003		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

			AS-11
	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
•	10/016,840	STEWART, RONAL	D L.
Advisory Action	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Gwendolyn A. Blackwell- Rudasill	1775	
The MAILING DATE of this communication app	ears on the cover sheet with the	correspondence add	ress
THE REPLY FILED 07 July 2003 FAILS TO PLACE TH Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (*condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appea Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.	ivoid abandoninent of this application is applicated as the second control of the second control of the second control of this application is applicated as the second control of the second control o	h places the applica	ation in
PERIOD FOR R	EPLY [check either a) or b)]		
 a)	Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth	iu date di tile ililai refect	
706.07(f). Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Of timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37	te date on which the petition under 37 CF of extension and the corresponding amount the shortened statutory period for reply fice later than three months after the ma CFR 1.704(b).	FR 1.136(a) and the appount of the fee. The appount of the fee. The apport originally set in the final rejeations date of the final rejeations.	ropriate extension propriate extension I Office action; or
1. A Notice of Appeal was filed on Appellant 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CF	's Brief must be filed within the p FR 1.191(d)), to avoid dismissal o	eriod set forth in of the appeal.	
2. The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered I			
(a) they raise new issues that would require furth		(see NOTE below);	
(b) They raise the issue of new matter (see Note	below);		
(c) they are not deemed to place the application issues for appeal; and/or	in better form for appeal by mat		
(d) they present additional claims without cance	eling a corresponding number of	finally rejected clain	ns.
NOTE: See Continuation Sheet.			
3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following reje	ection(s):		
4. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would canceling the non-allowable claim(s).			
5.⊠ The a)⊠ affidavit, b)☐ exhibit, or c)☐ request for application in condition for allowance because: §	or reconsideration has been cons See Continuation Sheet.	sidered but does NO	T place the
6. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered be raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.			
7. For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendme explanation of how the new or amended claims	ent(s) a) will not be entered or would be rejected is provided be	b)∏ will be entered low or appended.	and an
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows	•		
Claim(s) allowed:			
Claim(s) objected to:			
Claim(s) rejected			
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:			
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: 8. The proposed drawing correction filed on	is a) ☐ approved or b) ☐ disar	proved by the Exar	niner.
9. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statem	nent(s)(PTO-1449) Paper No(s).	·•	•
10. Other:		DEBORAH JOI SUPELWISORY PATENT	VES LA VES LA LEXAMINER
		SUPLAN.SUM FAILM	-

Continuati n She t (PTO-303)

Continuation of 2. NOTE:

The proposed amendment does not place the application in better form for appeal. Although Applicant has narrowed the claim to a range of 5-10 wt%, EP '128 still applies because because EP '128 has 10% of neodymium as an endpoint.

Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:

The affadavit fails to provide factual evidence showing the criticality of the neodymium oxide range and other glass components, which also have overlapping ranges with EP '128. The proposed amendment does not place the application in condition for allowance as 10% is a common point between the glass compositions of EP '128 and the present application.